

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering the present application. Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-25 were pending in the present application. Claims 4 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-20, and 22-25 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims. Claims 2, 3, 5-14, 19, 20, 22, and 25 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Claims 16-18, 23, and 24 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 15.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15-18, and 22-24 have been amended by way of this reply. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 22 have been amended to clarify that the inlets being claimed are all inlets to the receiving device. Claims 15-18, 23, and 24 have been amended to clarify that the outputs being claimed are all outputs of the valve. Further, claims 1 and 15 have been amended to more precisely recite the present invention. Specifically, the claims have been amended to recite that the valve controls liquid flow through the at least two inlets *with a single moving member*. Because the claims with this limitation were submitted to the Examiner for consideration on August 24, 2006, Applicant believes that the amendments do not necessitate an additional search. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 can be found, for example, in Fig. 1. Claims 4 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added by way of the amendments.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for not showing the structure to produce flat curved, or conical jet forms as well as the jet forms themselves. Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The abstract was objected to for minor informalities. The abstract has been amended in view of this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-25 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15 and 22 were rejected for not being clear on what inlets were being claimed. The claims have been amended to clarify that the inlets in each instance are inlets to the receiving device. Further, claims 16 and 17 were rejected for not being clear what is meant by the first output and the other output. The claims have been amended to clarify that the outputs are the outputs recited in claim 15. Further, claims 19, 20, 21, and 25 were rejected as not having antecedent basis for the conveying pump, and being unclear as to whether the conveying pump is being positively claimed. Claim 21 has been canceled. Regarding claims 19, 20, and 25, Applicant respectfully notes that claim 19 positively claims "a conveying pump." Claims 20 and 25 depend from claim 19. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7, 12, 13, and 15-25 of the present application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,402,052 (“Murawa”). Claims 1 and 15 have been amended by way of this reply. To the extent that the rejection may still apply, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 15 require, in part, “the valve controls liquid flow through the at least two inlets with a single moving member.”

Murawa discloses a pressure sensitive windshield washer nozzle. With reference to the nozzle embodiment shown in Figure 3 in Murawa, the apparatus has two movable pressure flow control valves 110, 112, each with movable ball checks 116a, 116b disposed therein. A low pressure flow control valve 110 controls liquid flow through one flow path 122a with a first movable ball check 116a, while a high pressure flow control valve 112 controls liquid flow through the other flow path 122b with a second movable ball check 116b. Thus, if the entire housing of Murawa is considered the valve of the claimed invention, as the Examiner asserts, then the liquid flow through the at least two inlets is controlled with two moving members 116a, 116b, and not a single moving member, as required by the claims. Alternatively, if one of the pressure flow control valves 110, 112 is considered the valve of the claimed invention, then the pressure flow control valve 110 or 112 controls fluid flow through only one inlet with a movable ball check 116a or 116b, and not at least two inlets, as required by the claims.

In view of the above, claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Murawa, at least for the above reasons. Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 12, 13, 15-20, and 22-25 depend, either directly or indirectly,

from claim 1 or 15. Thus, claims 2, 3, 5-7, 12, 13, 15-20, and 22-25 are patentable over Murawa, at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-10 and 14 of the present application were rejected under U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Murawa in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0234303 (“Berning”). Claim 1, from which claims 8-10 and 14 depend, has been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, claim 1 is patentable over Murawa. Berning discloses a fluidic insert that receives fluid under pressure from a fluid inlet tube and generates a specified spatial distribution of the fluid exiting the insert. Berning is only relied upon to disclose the nozzle insert having whirl chambers formed together with at least one wall of the receiving device and each connected to separate inlets. Berning does not teach or suggest separate flow paths, and thus fails to provide that which Murawa lacks with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Berning neither shows nor suggests a valve which controls liquid flow through at least two inlets with a single movable member, as required by claim 1.

In view of the above, Murawa and Berning, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa and Berning, at least for the above reasons. Claims 8-10 and 14 are dependent from claim 1. Thus, claims 8-10 and 14 are

patentable over Murawa and Berning, at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 of the present application was rejected under U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Murawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,082,636 (“Yoshida”). Claim 1, from which claim 11 depends, has been amended. To the extent that the rejection applies to the amended claim, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, claim 1 is patentable over Murawa. Yoshida discloses a washer nozzle assembly having an upper lip portion defining a nozzle opening extending further forward than the lower lip portion so that the part of the washer liquid directed upward is blocked by the longer upper lip portion. Yoshida does not teach or suggest separate flow paths, and thus fails to provide that which Murawa lacks with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Yoshida neither shows nor suggests a valve which controls liquid flow through at least two inlets with a single movable member, as required by claim 1.

In view of the above, Murawa and Yoshida, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over Murawa and Yoshida, at least for the above reasons. Claim 11 is dependent from claim 1. Thus, claim 11 is patentable over Murawa and Yoshida, at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 50-0591, under Order No. 17102/012001 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: November 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant